

AN ANALYSIS OF A TEAM TEACHING PROJECT
AT CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL,
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

by

445

VERL DEAN MARTIN

B. A., Phillips University, 1964

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1966

Approved by:

Charles M. Secor
Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Dr. Charles Peccolo for his advice and guidance in the preparation of this report and to Dr. James Boyd, Dr. Richard Griffith, Mr. Jack Foster, Mr. Roger Linnet and Mr. Thomas Myers for their assistance and willingness in providing information and needed data.

378.73
~~K160r~~
1966
M 384
c. 2

LD
2668
R4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Procedures of the Study	4
Definition of Terms	5
TEAM TEACHING IN WORLD HISTORY AND ENGLISH AT CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	7
Rationale for Team Teaching	7
Objectives of Team Teaching	10
Description of World History and English Project	10
Evaluation of World History and English Project	16
CONCLUSION	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY	31
APPENDIX A. Team Teaching Interview Form	38
APPENDIX B. Tables Showing Distribution of I.Q. and Achievement Scores of Sophomore Class of 1965-66, Central High School, Kansas City, Missouri	41
APPENDIX C. Excerpts from Curriculum Guides in Tenth Grade English and World History	44
APPENDIX D. A Unit on Latin America for the Team Teaching Course in World History and English	56

INTRODUCTION

An indication of the nature of modern society can be seen in the often-quoted cliché, the only thing that is certain seems to be change itself. American education has been no exception to this idea. However, the rate at which these phenomena take place, how long such changes remain a part of the educational picture, or what will be their long-lasting effect, cannot be dealt with with such certainty. Lasting innovations in education would appear to have progressed through three basic stages of development, or at least through variations of these three stages.

First was the initiatory or fetal level of development. This occurred when some need or deficiency in the existing system or approach was discovered. Unfortunately, in a number of cases, the need was often discovered by those outside of the field of education. Criticism and unfavorable publicity undoubtedly have given added incentive to those who attempted to develop solutions to such problems.

The second step was the period in which the new measures were tested and evaluated, tried in some schools and abandoned, tried in others and modified, or tried in still others and carried on per se. As school after school tested, evaluated and reported through the various means at their disposal, the accumulation of their findings eventually

led to the third process.

Finally, depending upon whether the deficiency still existed or whether the innovation sufficiently solved the problem, the new development either gradually passed from innovation to standard practice or out of existence.

Of course, this process was never as simple and clear cut as this discussion would make it seem. There always have been, and probably always will be, more than enough people who prematurely jump on or jump off of the bandwagon of any such movement to sufficiently blur the lines of demarcation. This, coupled with the decentralized nature of education in this country, has made these steps mere images in the background.

The concept of team teaching has been no exception to the aforementioned pattern. The decade of the 1950's brought with it numerous problems that caused many of this country's leading educators to take a look at the nation's schools. The post-war baby boom, the expansion of the national economy, technological advances and the phenomena known as the knowledge explosion, led many of these educational experts to the conclusion that traditional educational practices could not possibly satisfy the needs of the period.¹

¹Medill Bair and Richard G. Woodward, Team Teaching in Action, p. 215.

Along with other innovations designed to fulfill certain of those needs, the concept of using a team of specialized teachers to more effectively utilize new and existing materials, resources and time available was put into the experimental stage. Early reports of these projects seemed to indicate such a high degree of success that many schools launched programs without the careful preparation and planning exhibited by their earlier counterparts. The immediate results of this early bandwagon seems to have been a cooling of enthusiasm as unforeseen problems arose and the expected results were not obtained.² However, the cooler heads apparently prevailed, and by 1963 another increase in team teaching programs was reported. This did not, however, place team teaching safely into the third stage of development. Reports and articles as late as 1965 indicated that much in the area of experimentation and evaluation still needed to be done.³

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to (1) describe one of

²Editorial, "The Team Teaching Bandwagon," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXV (April, 1960), 207-208.

³David W. Beggs, III (ed.), Bold New Venture: Team Teaching, pp. 143-144.

the team teaching projects at Central High School, Kansas City, Missouri; (2) analyze the various features of the Central project with regard to its stated objectives; and (3) give an overall evaluation of it which would perhaps suggest means by which it could be improved.

Procedures of the Study

The information used in the description of the team teaching project was obtained almost entirely through the use of formal and informal interviews and scheduled or unscheduled visitations to observe class or planning sessions in progress. Background material was obtained by several interviews or conferences with the school principal and/or vice-principal. A semi-structured interview was conducted with each participating teacher in an effort to determine attitudes and to gather certain factual information concerning the background of the team members.⁴ Ten informal conferences were held with students involved in the project to gain some insight as to pupil reaction to the project. Fifteen scheduled class visitations and seven or eight unscheduled observations were conducted to see the team in actual operation. Finally, two planning and evaluation sessions were observed, one at the initiation of a unit of study and again

⁴See Appendix A, p. 38.

near the completion of that same unit.

The analysis and the evaluation of the team project were based upon information secured in the description and from a knowledge of team teaching acquired through a review of the literature on that subject.

The review consisted of team teaching programs reported through professional journals in the Kansas State University Library since 1959, general articles on team teaching that have been published since 1959, and several books on team teaching. Almost all of this material was found in the Kansas State University Library, with the exception of a few journals which were at the bindery. In this case, the facilities of the Zollar Library at Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma, were utilized to acquire the missing articles.

Definition of Terms

Team teaching--the cooperation of two or more teachers in the presentation, planning and evaluation of a unit or units of study to a predesignated group of students.

Master teacher--the teacher whose main responsibility in a team situation is to direct the planning, presentation and evaluation of the unit or units of study.

Helping teacher(s)--the teacher(s) whose main responsibility in a team situation is to assist the master teacher

in the planning, presentation and evaluation of the unit(s) of study.

Presentation group--the situation in which all students participating in a given team teaching program meet as one body for the presentation of basic material or information.

Discussion groups--the situation in which the presentation group is divided into smaller units of students for learning activities that are not feasible in the larger group.

Independent study--investigation or study pursued by students on their own time and under their own guidance.

Ability grouping--the placing of students into classes with others of similar scholastic capacity. At Central High School such grouping was based on intelligence test scores, achievement test scores, and past class performance.

Teacher load--the measurement of the responsibilities and duties of teachers expressed in units per week.⁵

⁵Harl R. Douglas, Modern Administration of Secondary Schools, pp. 96-105.

TEAM TEACHING IN WORLD HISTORY AND ENGLISH
AT CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

Rationale for Team Teaching

At the time of this study Central High School was housed in a building, the main section of which was constructed in 1917. The maximum student body capacity of the original site was limited to 1,600 persons. From 1918 until the Second World War, the expansion of the school population in Kansas City, Missouri, was handled rather effectively by the construction of new schools in the areas where they were needed. However, by the end of the War, Kansas City had reached its present limits and, although two new high schools have been erected since that time, the school-age population of the city increased at a rate higher than the schools could handle. Central High School's facilities were expanded in 1946 with the addition of a fifteen-unit classroom annex and again in 1949 with a three-unit vocational building. These additions brought the proposed maximum capacity up to approximately 2,000 students. These measures later proved insufficient as the student body reached 2,400 by 1963. The official population figure for September of 1965 was 2,653 students. This gradual process of overcrowding was accompanied by another social phenomenon.

The late 1940's began to show an increase in the

inner-city Negro population. In 1956 Central High School was accepting Negro students, and by the 1965-66 school year the process of re-segregation was practically completed. The enrollment figures for September of 1965 indicated only sixteen white students were attending Central High. Scores from intelligence and achievement tests which were collected by the personnel in the Central High School guidance center began to indicate some important aspects in the change which was occurring.

The interpretation which was drawn from those figures, by school administrators, was that while distribution of the results of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale seemed to be quite normal, a drastic positive skewness in the distribution of corresponding scores from the Stanford Achievement Test appeared to indicate that the majority of those tested were achieving far below their potential capacity. Data gathered from tests given to the sophomore class of 1965-66 was used to illustrate this conclusion, and it was stated that that information very nearly duplicated test results acquired from 1959 to 1964.⁶

In an attempt to solve those two problems of overcrowding and low achievement, a vice-principal was assigned to investigate possible solutions. The first step was to

⁶See Appendix B., p. 41.

assess the existing faculty, staff and physical facilities to determine whether or not the problems could be handled under those circumstances. During the 1964-65 school year the total faculty and staff numbered one hundred thirteen persons. Ninety-eight of these were teachers, four were administrators, five were counselors, one was a librarian, and five were members of the secretarial staff. The normal teacher load was five classes; one extra duty, usually in the nature of lunchroom, hall or home room assignments and often coming immediately before or after the teacher's lunch period; and one free or planning period. A seven-period day was utilized, and to keep the average class size down to thirty-five students, two or three classes, some of which were home room classes, were meeting in the auditorium. Needless to say, no one was pleased with this arrangement. It was discovered that three large classrooms were being used for classes that only half-filled them. One of these was a large science lecture room with the capacity to seat about fifty persons; the other two were large classrooms that had originally been used as home-making classes, one seating about seventy, the other having a total capacity of one hundred fifteen. After further consideration of the total situation, it was decided to initiate, starting with the Spring semester of the 1964-65 school year, four team teaching projects. Two were in ninth grade citizenship, involving

one hundred forty students and four teachers and utilizing the classroom that would accommodate seventy persons. The room seating fifty was used in a program for World History and Physical Science which involved two sections of forty-five students and three teachers for two two-hour blocks of time. Finally, the largest room was to be used in a project in World History and tenth grade English. In all, a total of four hundred students and ten teachers were participating in the team projects.

Objectives of Team Teaching

The general objectives for establishing the team teaching projects were the same for all of the programs. First, they were to utilize more effectively the existing space and personnel. Secondly, they were to provide a more effective utilization of available materials and resources. Finally, through these first two steps, they were to provide a more diversified, and therefore more effective, learning process.

Description of World History and English Project

The home base for the World History and English team was a large lecture hall, the dimensions of which were approximately ninety-five feet in length and thirty-five feet in width. This room was set up much in the manner of the standard classroom and was not, at the time of this study,

equipped with such special apparatus as moveable partitions, permanent motion picture or overhead projector screen. There were no other smaller classrooms definitely assigned to this project for use of the discussion groups or for independent study.

The team teaching team was composed of three teachers of varying backgrounds, education and teaching experience. The criteria for selection of all of the team members were, at first, willingness to participate in such projects. After an informal survey of available faculty members by the administrator working on the projects to determine such willingness, the educational backgrounds and the teaching experience of those expressing a desire to participate were scrutinized to determine the exact placement and makeup of the teams.

Teacher A of the World History-English team had been teaching Social Studies at Central for eleven and one-half years and was certified to teach all subjects in the area of social studies plus most of the courses offered in science. He held undergraduate degrees in both history and education, as well as a Master's degree in education. All of these degrees were granted by the University of Missouri.

Teacher B had two and one-half years of teaching experience, all of them at Central. "B" had attended Sheridan Junior College, Sheridan, Wyoming, from 1959 until

1961 and had then attended the University of Missouri at Kansas City until his graduation from that institution in 1963. He was granted an undergraduate degree in education and was certified to teach English. Teacher B also had, by the summer of 1965, completed eighteen hours of graduate work at the University of Missouri at Kansas City.

Teacher C was the youngest member of the team in terms of experience. He had had only one year of teaching experience. "C" graduated from the University of Oklahoma in 1961 with a Bachelor of Arts in the fields of History and English. After travel in Europe, he returned to the University of Missouri at Kansas City, where he completed the courses in education necessary for certification. Teacher C had also completed fifteen hours of graduate study in education at the University of Missouri at Kansas City.

Teacher A, on the basis of his experience and education, was initially designated the master teacher of the World History-English group. As time passed, however, this position eventually (though not officially) became a rotating one, falling to the member who seemed to be best qualified in any given area of study.

The teacher load of the team members was not significantly different from most of the other teachers at Central High School. Teacher A had a regular World History class of about twenty-three C-group students in addition to the

two team sections. He also had a homeroom as an extra duty. Teacher C had the same situation except that instead of a homeroom as an extra duty, he was a co-sponsor of the school yearbook. Teacher B had an A-group in eleventh grade English, the two team sections, and was co-sponsor of the student council.

Approximately one hundred seventy B-group sophomores participated in the English-World History program. These students were divided into two equal groups, one half meeting for a two-hour block during the second and third periods of the school day and the other half meeting in another two-hour block during the fifth and sixth periods. The use of time during these blocks was intended to be flexible, and the specific scheduling within them was left up to the members of that particular team. The project was to utilize presentation or large-group instruction, discussion groups and independent study, but the specific use of these devices as well as their scheduling was left to the discretion of the team.

The team projects were given priority in the use of audio-visual aids. The English-World History team was assigned a combination public address system-record player, a movie projector, a filmstrip projector, and a very portable desk-top overhead projector. An opaque projector was available from the audio-visual center, but was seldom used.

The basic course content followed that prescribed in the curriculum guides published by the Kansas City, Missouri, School District for both social studies and English, as did the basic course objectives.⁷ However, due to the interdisciplinary nature of the project, some modifications were made out of necessity.

Since the only curriculum guide provided for English courses by the Kansas City, Missouri, School District was itself rather flexible, it was decided that the major efforts toward curriculum integration would be made by coordinating the literature and composition portions of tenth grade English with the overall World History objectives and activities. The study of grammar was treated much as it would have been in a regular English class, and little attempt was made to integrate it. Usually a number of periods ranging from thirty to sixty minutes were set aside in each unit for instruction in grammar.⁸

Planning sessions were categorized into three major types. First were the long range sessions. These included a series of meetings in the week prior to the beginning of school in which a skeleton outline or schedule for the entire

⁷See Appendix C, p. 44.

⁸See Appendix D, p. 56.

year was made. This was actually little more than a modification of the outline from the curriculum guides. The second type of long-range session was the unit planning meeting that was held about every three or four weeks. These meetings were held just previously to the introduction of a new unit, and last-minute revisions were usually made at that time. The major purpose of these meetings, however, was to plan the unit to follow the one about to be introduced. It was in these meetings that the master teacher role gradually evolved into a rotating rather than a permanent position.

The short-range sessions were usually referred to as on-the-spot meetings. These were for the purpose of revision of the unit that was being conducted at the time.

The third type of session was for the purpose of evaluation or criticism. Toward the end of the 1965 Fall semester, a difference of opinion began to develop among two of the team members, and by the end of the 1965-66 school year these meetings were all but suspended. An evaluation session for the entire 1965-66 school year was scheduled for the last week of August, 1966. It was hoped that all of the teams could meet at that time and attempt a meaningful evaluation of their projects.

No formal evaluation devices were used in the 1965 Spring semester programs. Realizing the value of such an

evaluation, arrangements were made to provide this for the 1965-66 school year. During the second week of that school year, Form A of the Cooperative Social Studies Tests in Civics and Form A in World History was administered to the team groups. Forms B were given near the end of the same year. At the time of this paper the results were not available for investigation, nor had any official judgment concerning the future of the team projects been made. It was interesting to note, however, that only one of the members of the World History-English team planned to return to Central in a teaching capacity for the 1966-67 school term. Teachers A and B had signed teaching contracts in other school systems.

Evaluation of World History and English Project

The evaluative portion of this study was divided into two main areas of investigation. Such action was taken in an effort to achieve as much clarity as possible, and it seemed, at the time, to afford a more logical means of progression through the material.

The first area was one in which most of the actions and decisions concerning team teaching were made by the administrators at Central High School. Therefore it was called the area of administrative involvement and responsibility

The introduction of team teaching at Central High

seemed to parallel rather closely the steps through which most educational innovations have progressed. Needs or deficiencies were detected in the existing structure, and a search ensued for means by which these deficiencies could be corrected. While such a search need not fall inevitably within the realm of actual administrative involvement, it must certainly do so if the results of such investigation are to be initiated in the expectation of any lasting results.

Aside from the fact that the actual efforts to discover solutions for the problems of overcrowding and underachievement were carried on almost entirely by administrative personnel, an examination of the overall objectives of team teaching at Central, in relation to a definition advanced by G. T. Kowitz, tended to place the team programs into a broad area referred to as administrative innovation. According to Kowitz, such innovation was not aimed at the introduction of new course content, but rather it was directed toward better ways of achieving old or traditional goals.⁹ The very fact that the team teaching projects were introduced to bring about better utilization of facilities and personnel that already existed, with no actual change in course

⁹R. B. McQuigg and F. R. Smith (ed.), Secondary Schools Today: Readings for Educators, p. 222.

content or overall educational goals, sufficiently established the projects as administrative innovations or, as many classroom teachers preferred, as administrative devices.

The general goals for this innovation were based, then, on certain assumptions in relation to the expressed problems and their inherent limitations. The major assumption was that student achievement could be improved by increased use of a variety of educational techniques rather than only through the traditional lecture or presentation approach. The second basic assumption which was made was that the team method would best fulfill the existing needs when the limitations of personnel, space, and money were considered.

The first assumption has been fairly well substantiated by research in that area, though the results of such investigation tended to be more quantitative than qualitative.¹⁰ The second assumption, however, was quite another matter since success or failure of most projects of that nature has been dependent upon quite a number of variables.¹¹ One of the more important, perhaps the most important, measures to be considered in the handling of those variables was the amount and quality of administrative planning that

¹⁰R. W. DeRemer and D. R. Wynn, "Staff Utilization, Development and Evaluation," Review of Educational Research, XXXI (October, 1961), p. 394.

¹¹G. T. Kowitz, "Change and Improvement of School Practices," Phi Delta Kappan, XLII (February, 1961), p. 216-18.

must take place before any team teaching project should be initiated. Many articles on this subject had long and detailed lists of factors that should be considered.¹² Others merely listed general areas of importance and gave a few suggestions in each area.¹³ The best reported projects appeared to indicate that a conclusion reached by R. H. Anderson was very nearly always correct. The conclusion stated that the utmost care and planning, administrative and teacher, had to be undertaken for even the smallest steps if the total program was to be a success.¹⁴

The factors that were considered in the administrative planning for the World History and English project at Central High School were in the areas of physical facilities, personnel, scheduling, and evaluation. Flaws in this planning stemmed from two major sources; (1) inexperience and (2) a lack of adequate information concerning the various aspects of team teaching. In light of these conditions, it was surprising that no greater effort was made to obtain more information, or at least to consult someone with experience in the area. The use of an expert consultant at that

¹²L. W. Downey, "Direction Amid Change," Phi Delta Kappan, XLII (February, 1961), pp. 186-191.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴R. H. Anderson, "Three Examples of Team Teaching in Action," The Nation's Schools, LXV (May, 1960), 65.

particular stage of development might have been invaluable.¹⁵ The facilities of nearby universities should also have been more thoroughly investigated concerning the possibility of consultation and printed information. The University of Missouri at Kansas City, the University of Kansas, and Central Missouri State College were all within easy driving distance, while the University of Missouri, Kansas State Teachers College, and Kansas State University were not exactly inaccessible.

Deficiencies in physical facilities existed at Central in all of the team projects. The flaws, however, were not so much in the category of room selection as in the use of the facilities after they were selected. In the case of the English and World History room, no modifications were made except to move in more chairs. Some authorities feel that old space may be utilized with proper planning, but best results have been reported from projects in specially designed units or at least where some modification had taken place.¹⁶ The installation of moveable partitions seemed a highly feasible idea for this team project because of the largeness of the room and added ease with which it

¹⁵David W. Beggs, III (ed.), Bold New Venture; Team Teaching, p. 99.

¹⁶Luvern L. Cunningham, "Keys to Team Teaching," Overview, I (October, 1960), p. 55.

would have allowed team members to utilize it for discussion groups. This would have saved a great deal of time that was lost moving to other rooms for such groups.

Teacher assignment proved to be a hidden nemesis for the World History and English team. The background information on educational and teaching experience, which was listed in the descriptive portion of this paper, was assumed to be an adequate basis upon which assignment could be made. This later proved to have been an erroneous decision. It had been taken for granted that proper training and experience would be a sufficient starting point and that cooperation would necessarily follow because of the attitudes expressed by the team members concerning their willingness to participate in the project. While this attitude was essential, as attested to by Cunningham,¹⁷ a lack of cooperation between team members was attributed to certain differences of opinion over basic educational philosophy. On this point, at least two experts have reached the conclusion that a congruency of such values is absolutely necessary for any collaboration to occur within a team teaching situation.¹⁸ Therefore, it

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 54-55.

¹⁸Roy A. Larnae and Robert Ohm, "University of Chicago Laboratory School Freshman Project Involves Team Teaching, New Faculty Position and Regrouping of Students," National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXIV (January, 1960), pp. 288-289.

seemed that some such congruency should be exhibited before teacher assignment is made.

Another aspect of teacher assignment which seemed to have been overlooked was the assignment of teacher load. When pupil-teacher ratios and the extra duties of the team members were compared to those of the regular classroom teachers, the responsibilities of the two groups appeared to be about equal. This comparison, however, did not take into consideration the extra time for preparation and planning which would be required of the team teachers if their project was to meet its desired objectives. The diversity and flexibility which these objectives required could only have been met with careful planning, and such planning should not be hampered by the same time limitations that are placed upon a regular classroom teacher.¹⁹ An extra planning period should have been provided for the teachers participating in the team project. Some school systems have gone so far as to give team teachers extra pay for their efforts.²⁰

The administrative scheduling of the World History and English groups was not considered to be one of the drawbacks of the program. The two-hour blocks, while not

¹⁹Editorial, "The Team Teaching Bandwagon," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (April, 1960), p. 234.

²⁰Beggs, op. cit., p. 33.

as flexible as the scheduling described in some projects, such as the daily scheduling at Brookhurst Junior High School, Anaheim, California, where scheduling was made on an individual and daily basis,²¹ did represent a more realistic attempt to attain flexibility within the limits imposed by conditions at Central High School. Since flexibility within the two-hour blocks was the responsibility of the team members, breakdowns in that area cannot be blamed entirely on administrators.

The responsibility for one serious oversight, however, has been placed at the feet of Central administrators. This oversight was in the area of evaluation. No really practical method of evaluation was ever considered in the planning and initiatory stages of the team teaching projects. The projects had been in operation for one complete semester before any definite plans for evaluation were made. Even at that point, the only formal evaluation planned was in content achievement. Well constructed team teaching projects, without exception, have in their early planning stages included provisions for adequate evaluation. Many of these, in keeping with their overall objectives, included evaluation not only of course achievement, but also of materials, needs of

²¹McQuigg and Smith (ed.), op. cit., p. 260.

students, and the personnel involved.²² The failure to include provisions for effective evaluation was seen as a definite disadvantage. Some of the problems which developed during the 1965-66 school year might not have occurred had proper evaluation been made during the Spring semester of 1965.

The second portion of the evaluation of the World History and English team teaching project was that area in which most of the actions and decisions were made by the teachers involved. The shortcomings in the area of teacher involvement and responsibility were for much the same reasons as those which occurred in administrative involvement and responsibility. Inexperience, the lack of a thorough understanding of some of the fundamental concepts of team teaching, and finally a lack of enthusiasm were all blamed for the stagnation which occurred in the project. The implications of these faults were demonstrated most clearly in the planning phase of teacher involvement, as they were in administrative involvement.

The most glaring disappointment in the entire team program was undoubtedly the degenerated state of the team planning sessions. This was initially attributed to the

²²L. J. Cronbach, "Course Improvement through Evaluation," Teacher College Record, LVIV (May, 1963), p. 672-86.

disagreement which had developed between two of the teachers in the team. The effect of this dispute was quite demoralizing, and its effects were seen in several aspects of the total program. The most apparent was demonstrated within the planning sessions themselves. It was in these sessions that the master teacher role had evolved into a rotating rather than a permanent position. This arrangement was not an unworkable one if the rotation had been based upon teacher talents and specialization.²³ This idea had been expressed by team members, but actual observation of sessions did not reinforce that impression. Not only was collaboration affected during the planning stage by the team split, but it was noticed also that some differences in emphasis and interpretation were being given in the actual teaching process. In fact, the role of master teacher was changed when it was applied to the actual teaching situation. The dispute, previously referred to, also caused, or at least was partly responsible for, the evolution of the teaching duties from a situation in which specialization played a major role to one in which one teacher would handle the morning section and another would handle the afternoon group, with little or no

²³M. F. Noall, "The Need for and Effects of Schedule Modification in Wahlquist, Roosevelt and Hurricane High Schools," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), p. 108.

regard for special ability. Teacher C handled World History presentation in the morning group, while Teacher A took care of the same material in the afternoon. Teacher B was responsible for teaching grammar in both sections. While this denuded the project of the advantages of teacher specialization, it also seriously hampered the achievement of flexibility.

The scheduling within the two-hour sessions was the responsibility of the teaching team and, as such, reflected the neglect of one of the major assumptions upon which the objectives of team teaching were based. The use of presentation groups was nearly four times that of the discussion groups.²⁴ Aside from this apparent predominance, observation of actual discussion groups revealed little of what could actually be considered class discussion. These groups usually numbered about twenty-eight pupils, and only a small minority actually participated. For a majority of the students, these groups were nothing more than a smaller presentation group. The concept of independent study also tended to reinforce the overall dominance of the presentation approach. All independent study was evaluated by library projects and reports made to the whole group.

This situation presented quite a limited concept of team teaching when compared to projects that reported

²⁴See Appendix D, p. 56.

approximately forty percent of their total class time as being spent in discussion groups numbering from fifteen to twenty pupils.²⁵ It was quite limited, also, when compared to the released time independent study procedures that were reported by Trump.²⁶ The situation seemed to have added proof to the idea that no concept of class size was justifiable without consideration of function, purpose, and procedure.²⁷

Audiovisual materials were often utilized in the World History and English project, but again the nature of the equipment available made it best suited for presentation group use.

A great deal of blame was placed upon the facilities in which the team functioned in regard to the dominant use of the presentation groups. However, it must be noted that little effort was made to correct the situation. Team morale and cooperation may have had more than a little to do with the situation. The lack of overall individual team evaluation was a serious hindrance in this light.

²⁵Lawrell Jensen and others, "Eighth Grade Team Teaching at the Roosevelt Junior High School," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (April, 1960), p. 240-43.

²⁶McQuigg and Smith, op. cit., pp. 258-268.

²⁷R. H. Johnson and M. D. Lobb, "The Transformation of the Sacred Secondary-School Schedule," California Journal of Secondary Education XXXV (February, 1960), p. 105.

It was interesting to note the reaction of a portion of the students involved in the team program. Of those interviewed, a majority expressed dissatisfaction with the programs. The objections ranged from boredom to class size, and a few expressed dislike of one or two of the team teachers. The most common objection was that the presentation groups were boring because it was always pretty much the "same old thing." Some disliked the confusion and the waste of time in trying to settle the group down at the beginning of the two-hour periods. Another interesting, though perhaps not too reliable, element that was discovered among this group was that those who felt they had been successful in the team project also felt they had been successful in regular courses in English and social studies. Those opinions seemed to concur with tendencies reported by Larmee and Ohm in their investigation of a team project at the University of Chicago Laboratory School.²⁸

CONCLUSION

The description and analysis of the World History and English team teaching project at Central High School have shown the following facts. The project was based upon inadequate preparation by administrators and team members

²⁸Larmee and Ohm, op. cit., p. 289.

through incomplete understanding of the basic concepts of team teaching. This led to incomplete planning on the part of both teachers and administrators. The stated objectives for the team project were not achieved due to (1) facilities which were not entirely appropriate, (2) assumptions basic to the objective not being kept in mind, (3) large or presentation group domination of class time, and (4) the unfortunate presence of basic disagreements among team members.

The facts presented led to the ultimate conclusion that the project as it existed at the close of the 1965-66 school year was, at best, of limited value. The only saving aspect of the project appeared to be in the fact that it did, to a certain extent, help to ease the existing problem of overcrowding.

If it should be decided in August of 1966 that this project will be continued in the 1966-67 school year, the following suggestions have been made for the improvement of the team teaching program. Adequate preparation would be improved by (1) use of a specialist or consultant, (2) a thorough review of literature in the area of team teaching, (3) more attention to educational philosophy and personality in selection of team members, (4) moveable partitions for the World History and English room, and (5) provisions for the evaluation of pupil achievement, materials and resource utilization, and personnel included from the very beginning.

The project might be more effectively carried out by (1) careful planning with the objectives of the project clearly in mind, (2) provisions for teacher self-evaluation as well as evaluation of student achievement, (3) flexibility obtained through such evaluation, and (4) wise use of teacher specialities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Bair, Medill, and Richard G. Woodward. Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964. 215 pp.

Beggs, David W., III. Decatur-Lakeview High School: A Practical Application of the Trump Plan. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Incorporated, 1964. 244 pp.

_____. (ed.). Bold New Venture: Team Teaching. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1964. 178 pp.

_____, and Donald C. Manlove. Bold New Venture: Flexible Scheduling. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1965. 157 pp.

Douglas, Harl R. Modern Administration of Secondary Schools. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1954. 589 pp.

McQuigg, R. B., and F. R. Smith (ed.). Secondary Schools Today: Readings for Educators. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965. 404 pp.

Morse, Arthur D. Schools of Tomorrow, Today. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Incorporated, 1960. 191 pp.

Shaplin, Judson T., and Henry F. Olds, Jr. (ed.). Team Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964. 375 pp.

B. PERIODICALS

Allen, D. W., and R. B. Moore. "Nothing Ventured, Nothing Gained," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 91-93.

_____. "Talents, Time, Tasks and Teachers," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (April, 1960), 232-235.

Anderson, Robert B. "Team Teaching," NEA Journal, L (March, 1961), 52-54.

Anderson, R. H. "Team Teaching, New Learning Concepts Demand Changes in School Plant Design," The Nation's Schools, LXV (June, 1960), 75-82.

_____. "Three Examples of Team Teaching in Action," The Nation's Schools, LXV (May, 1960), 62-65+.

Bloomenshine, Lee L. "Team Teaching in San Diego, The First Year," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 181-191.

Bovinet, Wesley G. "Glenbrook Reports on Four Experiments on Utilization of Staff," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 244-254.

Bush, Robert N., and D. W. Allen. "Flexible Scheduling," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLVII (March, 1963), 73-98.

Campbell, B. D., and others. "Divisible Cluster Plan for a Compact Elementary School," Architectural Record, CXXXVIII (March, 1965), 176-177.

"Clustered Units Expand Existing Schools," Architectural Record, CXXXIX (February, 1966), 168-169.

Cooper, Walter L. "Use of Tapes, Language Laboratory, and Teaching Teams at the J. Sterling Morton High School and Junior College," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 233-243.

Cordry, Vernon. "A More Flexible Schedule at Fremont," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 114-116.

"Critical Look at Team Teaching," Illustrated Instructor, LXXI (October, 1961), 39-42.

Cronbach, L. J. "Course Improvement Through Evaluation," Teacher College Record, LXIV (May, 1963), 672-686.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Keys to Team Teaching," Overview, I (October, 1960), 54-55.

- De Remer, R. W., and D. R. Wynn. "Staff Utilization, Development and Evaluation," Review of Educational Research, XXXI (October, 1961), 393-405.
- Downey, L. W. "Direction Amid Change," Phi Delta Kappan, XLII (February, 1961) 186-191.
- Ediger, M. "Team Teaching and the Schools: Advantages and Disadvantages," High Points, XLVII (December, 1965), 55-57.
- Fowler, Fred M. "Partial Design Solutions, a Waste," American School Board Journal, CXLIV (October, 1962), 35-36.
- Ginther, J. R., and W. A. Shroyer. "Team Teaching in English and History at the Eleventh Grade Level," School Review, LXX (Autumn, 1962), 303-313.
- Gray, H. P., and C. T. Fynboe. "Teaching Assistants," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (April, 1960), 246-249.
- Hart, H. C. "Classroom Structures Rapidly Changing; Team Teaching," Education, LXXXVI (December, 1965), 199-200.
- Howe, Harold. "Experimentation at Newton," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 117-118.
- _____. "The High School Principal in Newton, Massachusetts, Reacts to Re-development," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 122-136.
- Jensen, Lawrell, and others. "Eighth Grade Team Teaching at the Roosevelt Junior High School," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (April, 1960), 236-243.
- Johnson, R. H., and M. D. Lobb. "The Transformation of the Sacred Secondary-School Schedule," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 96-105.
- Klausmeier, H. J., and W. Wiersma. "Team Teaching and Achievement," Education, LXXXVI (December, 1965), 238-242.
- Kowitz, G. T. "Change and Improvement of School Practices," Phi Delta Kappan, XLII (February, 1961), 216-218.

Landers, J., and C. Mercurio. "Improving Curriculum and Instruction for the Disadvantaged Minorities," Journal of Negro Education, XXXIV (Summer, 1965), 362.

Larmee, Roy A., and Robert Ohm. "University of Chicago Laboratory School Freshman Project Involves Team Teaching, New Faculty Position and Regrouping of Students," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 275-289.

Lewis, P. "Facilities for the School of the Future: a Bibliography," Audiovisual Instructor, VII (October, 1962), 562-564.

"Maximum Flexibility for a Junior High School," Architectural Record, CXXXIX (February, 1966), 170-173.

Michael, Lloyd S. "Team Teaching," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLVII (May, 1963), 36-63.

Noall, M. F. "The Need for and Effects of Schedule Modification in Wahlquist, Roosevelt and Hurricane High Schools," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 106-110.

_____. "Utah Staff Utilization Studies," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 139-140.

_____ and Lawrell Jensen. "Team Teaching at Roosevelt Junior High School, Duchesne County, Utah," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 156-163.

_____ and Maurice Nuttall. "Staff Utilization Through Language Arts Reorganization, Hurricane, Utah," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 148-155.

_____ and Gale Rose. "Team Teaching at the Wahlquist Junior High School, Weber County, Utah," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 164-171.

_____ and Parry Wilson. "Paraprofessional Helpers in a Language Arts Program at the Logan City High School, Utah," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (January, 1960), 172-177.

- Peterson, C. H. "Team Teaching's Three Variables," American School Board Journal, CXLIX (November, 1964), 15-17.
- Sands, David A. "Secondary-School Scheduling, a Break with the Pattern," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 131-134.
- "Schools that Look to the Future," Architectural Record, CXXXIX (February, 1966), 163-167.
- Shaplin, J. T. "Cooperative Teaching Definitions and Organizational Analysis," National Elementary Principal, XLIV (January, 1965), 14-20.
- Stafford, Curtis. "Teacher Time Utilization with Teacher Aids," Journal of Educational Research, LVI (October, 1962), 82-88.
- Staltenberg, James C. "Team Teaching in Junior High School," Educational Leadership, XVIII (December, 1960), 153-155.
- Stevens, A. C. "A Flexible Seven-Period Day in Junior High School," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 119-121.
- Stevens, John M., and A. W. Richards. "Team Teaching in World Geography, Junior High School," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (April, 1960), 244-245.
- Stillman, Donald L. "Experimenting with a Double-Period Schedule at San Marcos High School," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 122-123.
- Stone, William Jack. "New Designs for Secondary-School Scheduling," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 126-30.
- "The Team Teaching Bandwagon," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (April, 1960), 207-208.
- Trump, J. L. "Flexible Class Schedules," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (February, 1960), 94-95.
- Van Dalen, D. B. "How to Facilitate Change," American School Board Journal, CXLIX (November, 1964), 7-9.

Wiedersum, F. P. "Circular Auditorium Subdivides into Four,"
Architectural Record, CXXXVIII (March, 1965), 180.

Williams, E. L. "Team Teaching: a Further Look," National
Elementary Principal, XLIV (January, 1965), 100-102.

APPENDIX A

TEAM TEACHER INTERVIEW FORM

I. Educational Background

Undergraduate College _____

Dates Attended _____

Degree _____

Graduate Study _____

Dates _____

Undergraduate Hours in Education _____

In Teaching Field _____

Graduate Hours in Education _____

In Teaching Field _____

II. Teaching Experience

At Central _____

Elsewhere _____

III. Attitudes and Opinions

Toward Teaching _____

Toward Central _____

Toward Team Teaching _____

APPENDIX B

TABLES SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF I. Q. AND ACHIEVEMENT SCORES
OF SOPHOMORE CLASS OF 1965-66, CENTRAL
HIGH SCHOOL, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OF THE SOPHOMORE CLASS OF 1965-66
ON THE STANFORD-BINET INTELLIGENCE SCALE

I. Q. Scores (Median 95; Mean 101)	Number of People
146+	0
141-145	1
136-140	0
131-135	1
126-130	1
121-125	9
116-120	18
111-115	42
106-110	79
101-105	94
96-100	120
91-95	101
86-90	90
81-85	52
76-80	26
71-75	19
66-70	14
61-65	1
56-60	1
50-55	0

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTILE RANKING OF THE SOPHOMORE CLASS
OF 1965-66 ON THE STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Percentile Ranks	Number of People
96-100	8
91-95	13
86-90	20
81-85	4
76-80	12
71-75	21
66-70	18
61-65	12
56-60	20
51-55	24
46-50	39
41-45	41
36-40	56
31-35	40
26-30	45
21-25	61
16-20	55
11-15	69
6-10	86
1-5	142

APPENDIX C

EXCERPTS FROM CURRICULUM GUIDES IN TENTH GRADE
ENGLISH AND WORLD HISTORY

1. "Curriculum Guide, English - Minimum Essentials, Grades 7-12," Secondary Curriculum Bulletin No. 123, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, July, 1960, pp. 24-30.

Tenth-Grade Minimum Essentials Guide

I. Mechanics (Refer to "Style Sheet")

A. Capitalization (review if necessary)

B. Punctuation

1. All uses of comma--new emphasis on:
 - a. Restrictive and non-restrictive clauses and phrases
 - b. Apposition
 - c. Direct quotations
 - d. Broken direct quotations
2. Semi-colon (review if necessary)
3. Colon: letter and list; i.e., following these, the following, as follows, etc., and following numbers
4. Apostrophe--3 uses (review from 7-8)
5. Quotation marks
 - a. Paragraphing quoted dialogues
 - b. Quoting a title inside of direct quotation
 - c. Indirect quotation (no marks)
6. Underlining (Italics)
 Note: Change "Style Sheet" to agree with text, p. 329.

C. Structure

1. Clauses
 - a. Use of adjective, adverb, noun clauses--not just definitions (adjective clauses--include those starting with where or when)
 - b. Difference between restrictive and non-restrictive (punctuation difference, too!); between dependent and independent or subordinate and main
2. Sentences: write and punctuate simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex sentences
3. Parts of speech
 - a. By definition
 - b. By recognition of what they do in a sentence
(1) Verb

- (2) Noun--pronoun
- (3) Conjunctions (from memory work in 9th grade)
- (4) Prepositions with their objects
- (5) Modifiers
 - (a) Adjectives (single word)
 - (b) Adverb (single word)
 - (c) Adjective phrase (prepositional, participial, infinitive)
 - (d) Adverb Phrase (prepositional, infinitive)
 - (e) Adjective clause (review from memory work on the words that "signal" such clauses in 9th grade)
 - (f) Adverb clause

c. By classification

- (1) Pronouns
 - (a) Personal
 - (b) Relative
 - (c) Demonstrative
 - (d) Indefinite
 - (e) Interrogative
 - (2) Adjectives
 - (a) Limiting
 - (b) Descriptive
 - (c) Proper
 - (d) Pronominal
 - (e) The articles: a, an, the
 - (f) Demonstrative
 - (3) Nouns
 - (a) Common
 - (b) Proper (note capitalization)
 - (c) Collective (note verb agreement)
 - (d) Optional: abstract, concrete, adverbial
 - (4) Verbs
 - (a) Transitive
 - (b) Intransitive
 - (c) Additional information: voice and tense-names
 - (5) Conjunctions
 - (a) Coordinate
 - 1. Simple: and, or, nor, but
 - 2. Correlatives: either-or, neither-nor, not only- but also
 - (b) Subordinate (memorized in 9th grade)
4. Special emphasis in usage problems (levels of usage)
- a. Double negatives involving no, not, hardly, scarcely, never, nowhere, none, no one, nobody, and but
 - b. It says in the book for the author says

- c. Myself for I or me
- d. Good-well, sure-surely, real-really, most-almost,
unless-without, less-fewer
- e. Then there for those; these here for these
- f. All the farther for as far as
- g. Sort of and kind of for rather
- h. Off of and off from for off
- i. Where at for where
- j. Between for among
- k. Try and for try to
- l. Reason is because for reason is that
- m. Due to for because of
- 5. Case (pronouns only, since they change form)
 - a. Subject, predicate nominative (word, pronoun)--
after linking verbs
 - b. Direct object
 - c. Indirect object
 - d. Object of preposition, practiced together with
pronouns, especially compound pronoun objects
 - e. Apposition
 - f. Subject of infinitive (in objective case)
- 6. Comparison of adjectives and adverbs
- 7. Abbreviations and their use
 - a. Ampersand (&)--not used in themes
 - b. Etc.--not used in themes
 - c. Numbers--written out unless more than three words

D. Legibility (review "Style Sheet" requirements and
Handwriting Scale")

E. Spelling

- 1. This list is to be used on the Minimum Essentials
Test at the end of the 10th grade:

accomplish	environment	morale	principal
acquire	equipped	muscle	principle
annual	excellent	naturally	probably
apparatus	exercise	necessary	professor
argument	expense	neighbor	pursue
arguing	experiment	nickel	pursuit
article	finance	noticeable	quantity
athletic	foreign	occasion	realize
benefit	generally	occasionally	receipt
benefited	grateful	occur	receive
brilliant	guidance	occurred	regard
changeable	holy	occurrence	relieve
chief	humorous	official	ridiculous
commit	imaginary	opportunity	separate
committed	imagination	origin	shepherd

committee	immediately	original	shoulder
control	intelligent	peaceable	sophomore
controlled	intelligence	permanent	specimen
criticism	island	personal	stretch
dealt	judgment	persuade	succeed
decision	knowledge	politician	temperature
despair	laboratory	possess	therefore
destroy	license	possession	thorough
develop	likely	practical	unusual
difference	loneliness	prefer	usually
disappoint	magazine	preferred	vegetable
divine	medicine	preparation	wholly

2. Homonyms, see text, pp. 157, 176, 309, 333, 334.
3. Words used in study of language: grammar, principal parts, synonyms, adjective, etc.
4. Other words from text, pp. 332-337, and from pupils' reading and writing
5. Syllabication
6. Weekly spelling tests will be administered as follows:
 - a. Twenty new words
 - b. Five review words
 - c. Grade Scale - E = 0 errors
 S = 1 error
 M = 2 errors
 I = 3 errors
 I- = 4 errors
 F = 5 errors

F. Vocabulary

1. Second part of Word Wealth
2. Review first part of Word Wealth for basic roots, prefixes, suffixes
3. Technical words used in various parts of this course:

abstract (meaning)	ampersand	analysis
allegory	allusion	atmosphere
alliteration	anonymous	(setting)
ballad	idyl (idyll)	refrain
bibliography	imagery	repetition
blank verse	incident	research
browsing	informal	resolving a con-
	(not clothes)	flict (resolu-
cadence	inverted order	tion-denouement)
chronological	irony	revelation
comedy		rhetoric
concise	legend	rising action

connotation	local color	scene (drama)
contemporary	mental image	setting
collaborator	mood	soliloquy
clarity (coherence)	monosyllable	sonnet
clue	multiple	stage business
conflict (plot)		stanza
cue	narration	stereotypes,
	<u>non-sequitur</u>	stereotyped
denotation	novelist	sub-topic
derivation		suspense
description	omniscient	
documentation	opinion	theme (both)
Dewey Decimal	organization	<u>Thesaurus</u>
System	(main topic &	title
draft	sub-topics)	tragedy
dramatist	overtones	transition
	oversimplification	unabridged
editorial		unities in drama
edition	pantomime	(time, place,
elegy	parliamentary	action)
epic	procedure	Universality
epigram	parody	(as applied to
extract	pastoral	theme, charac-
	pathos	ter--why?)
fallacy (esp. as	plagiarism	variety
connected with	plausible	verse
<u>logic</u>)	playwright	versification
figurative language	polysyllable	visualization
fluency	predict	
foot (verse!)	preface	
footnotes	pun	wordiness
force (emphasis)	purpose	
foreshadowing (dra-		
matic forecast)		
	READER'S GUIDE	
glossary	redundant,	
graphic	redundancy	

II. Writing

A. Organization as a process

1. Main topic
2. Sub-topics
3. Transitions
4. Introduction, body, conclusion--useful outline

B. Familiarity with terminology involved in composition

1. Exposition
2. Narration
3. Description
4. Dialogue (punctuated properly)
5. Essay
6. Theme (both meanings: "theme" as a written exercise; "theme" as the stated or unstated purpose of writer)
7. Figures of speech: simile, metaphor, personification, alliteration
8. Unity in sentence, paragraph, theme
9. Summary (clincher) sentence

C. Responsibility in criticizing own writing

1. Recognition of run-on sentences
2. Recognition of sentence fragments
3. Recognition of misplaced modifiers
4. Recognition of indefinite antecedent
5. Recognition of lack of agreement in number with antecedent
6. Recognition of lack of agreement between subject and verb
7. Recognition of dangling modifiers
8. Recognition of consistence in these--and tense sequence
9. Recognition of correct plurals and possessives
10. Recognition of lack of coherence in a sentence

D. Special problems connected with writing

1. Documentation
2. Revision
3. Plagiarism
4. Trite expressions
5. Continuation of practice, suggested for 9th grade, of using transitional word or phrase for every sentence.

E. Subject matter for writing practice

1. Letters
 - a. Friendly: include invitation, regret, thank-you
 - b. Business: include telegrams, want-ads, orders, applications
2. Analysis of theme of story or poem (why did author write it?)
3. Summary of story, play, novel (attention to brevity)
4. What is the skeleton outline of what happens?
5. Description of characters--in book or classroom
6. Analysis of character (character sketch)
7. Editorial

8. Personal essay
9. Formal essay
10. Informative article--how do you make something, do something, use something?
11. Paraphrase of a poem
12. Precis of expository article (science book?)
13. Discussion of another's method: topic sentence and development thereof. How done? Material can be from any text or from opening paragraphs in novel. What does author tell, how, how well?
14. Limerick, couplet, ballad, sonnet (from imitation)
15. Autobiography
16. Argumentative essay on current event

III. Reading

- A. Familiarity with terminology involved in reading
 1. Check II-B in this course guide
 2. Check "literary" words under Vocabulary in this course guide
- B. Knowledge of literary types
 1. Novel
 - a. Setting (how presented)
 - b. Plot (point of view, conflict, variety of solutions--including no solution)
 - c. Characterization (interaction of characters, author's method of revelation--growth or "puppet-like" quality)
 - d. Theme (author's purpose)
 2. Short Story--same as III-B-1--including "single impression"
 3. Poetry (paraphrasing, reading aloud for cadence and sensory impressions, figurative language, inverted order plus omission of words)
 4. Drama
 - a. Comedy, tragedy
 - b. Characters (realistic or romantic)
 - c. Comparison of advertising for drama found in ads (movie, T. V., stage) to literary reviews about the same drama
 - d. Dialogue as clues to past, hints about future
 - e. Flashbacks as method of overcoming time and space limitations
 5. Essay (note bias and/or personality of author)
 6. Biography
- C. Special reading projects
 1. Newspaper and magazines (Kansas City Star and Times)

- analyzed in class)
2. Individual reports on preferences in magazines
 3. Analysis of advertisements--fallacies in logic
 4. Analysis of editorials in newspapers and magazines
 5. Listening to directions--following directions given in series
 6. One free-reading day per week in class
 7. One book report per grade period--the record to be kept on cumulative card started in 9th grade
 8. Memory work
 9. Two or three books a semester from the English Rental Library--these are recommended choices:

Adventures in Appreciation

Julius Caesar

Silas Marner, if it was not read in the 9th grade

Adventures of Huckleberry Finn

Les Misérables

House of Seven Gables

Great Expectations

David Copperfield

Essays Then and Now

Notable Short Stories (Anthology)

Within Our Gates (Anthology)

Poems for Enjoyment (Anthology)

Champions (Anthology)

10. Mythological references (pupils should know stories involved)
 - a. Between Scylla and Charybdis (a choice between two difficulties)
 - b. A Lotus-eater (one who passes his life in idleness and dreamy ease)
 - c. A Siren (a beautiful woman who lures one to destruction)
 - d. To look to one's laurels (to take care lest one's high position be lost)
 - e. Delphic words (words which are mysterious and hard to interpret)
 - f. An Apollo (an exceedingly handsome man)
 - g. An Adonis (same as above)
 - h. The Midas-touch (the power of making money)
 - i. A Procrustean system (a system which insists that everyone shall conform to the same scheme, at whatever cost)
 - j. Pandora's box (surprises, usually unpleasant, although not necessarily so)
 - k. Mounting Pegasus (attempting to compose poetry or deliver an eloquent oration)

- l. The Waters of Lethe (any experience that brings forgetfulness of care)
- m. An Amazon (a woman of great physical strength)
- n. A Terpsichorean feat (unusual skill in dancing)
- o. Harpy (a rapacious person)
- p. A Protean artist (one who can assume various roles successfully)

IV. Listening

- A. Following oral directions given in a series
- B. Picking out main idea in a piece of literature read aloud

2. "Curriculum Guide for Social Studies, Grades 7-12 (General and Adapted Courses), Secondary Curriculum Bulletin No. 129, Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools, 1962, pp. 200-202.

UNIT SIX: Our World Today Strives to Achieve Freedom and Peace in the Face of Challenging Problems
(suggested time - nine weeks)

- I. The United Nations seeks peaceful solutions within a growing group of nations.
 - A. Earlier attempts for World organization
 1. Grotius, 1600's
 2. Congress of Vienna, 1815
 3. League of Nations, 1918-1939
 - B. Organization
 1. Assembly
 2. Security Council
 3. Economic-Social Council
 4. Trusteeship Council
 5. International Court of Justice
 6. Specialized agencies
 - C. Problems
 1. Establishing Israel
 2. Korean War
 3. Congo
 4. Secretary-General's office
 5. Weaknesses in organization

Vocabulary

Atlantic charter
 Dumbarton Oaks
 trusts
 UNICEF

Uniting for Peace
 Resolution
 U Thant
 Zionism

II. The western nations band together in protective blocs.

- A. American unilateral assistance
 - 1. Reasons for abandoning isolation
 - 2. Marshall Plan
 - 3. Truman Doctrine
- B. NATO
 - 1. Formed against attack
 - 2. Membership
 - 3. Headquarters
- C. European cooperation
 - 1. Benelux
 - 2. Coal and steel community
 - 3. Common market
 - 4. Proposed merger of "6" and "7"

Vocabulary

Euratom
 Point Four

Schuman plan

III. Communist Russia aims at world domination.

- A. Causes for revolution
 - 1. Reduced power
 - 2. Reform, only surface
 - 3. Minority persecutions
 - 4. Military defeats
- B. Establishment of Communism
 - 1. Double revolution
 - a. Kerensky moderates
 - b. Bolsheviks revolt
 - 2. Lenin
 - a. Radical changes
 - b. New economic policy
 - 3. Stalin
 - a. War against Trotsky
 - b. 5-year plans

4. Krushchev
 - a. De-Stalinization
 - b. Peace and programs
- C. Features of communism
 1. Democratic window dressing
 2. International domination
 3. Isolation of individuals

Vocabulary

anarchist	НКВД(ОГПУ)
kulak	October revolution
Menshevik	

IV. Asia, Africa, and Latin America seek their places in the sun.

- A. Asia
 1. India
 - a. World War II problem
 - b. Pakistan-Indian split
 - c. Progress and neutrality
 2. Southeast Asia
 - a. Indonesia
 - b. Malaya
 - c. Burma
 - d. Thailand
 3. Moslem area
 - a. Importance of oil
 - b. Anti-western feeling
 - c. Arab league
- B. Africa
 1. Southern friction
 - a. Union apartheid
 - b. Kenya Mau-Mau
 2. French community
- C. Latin America
 1. Organization of American States
 2. Relations with U.S.A.

Vocabulary

Gandhi	Nasser
Nehru	Nkrumah

APPENDIX D

A UNIT ON LATIN AMERICA FOR THE TEAM TEACHING COURSE
IN WORLD HISTORY AND ENGLISH

LATIN AMERICA
(3 Weeks)
May 16 - June 3, 1966

Week of May 16-20, 1966

Monday

- Myers -Introduction of Unit--Latin America before Coloniza-
and tion
- Foster -Maps--Physical maps to show size relationship with
European nations; outline map on overhead projector
to show areas of civilization; students draw free-
hand maps
- Lecture on South American Indians--civilization
level, culture, religion, social structure
- Assign extra-credit reports on Aztecs

Tuesday

- Myers -Review of maps with overhead projector
and -Filmstrip, The Incas
- Foster -Review of filmstrip and remind of reports
- 55 min. - - - - -
- Linnet -Writing an informative article--magazines, news-
55 min. papers, etc.
- Organization--what to look for--where to look
- Documentation

Wednesday

- Myers -Film on Mayan Art--22 minutes
and -Filmstrip, Amazon Village
- Foster -Overview of Precolonial Civilization
- 55 min. - - - - -
- Linnet Taking notes from sources--putting notes into your
55 min. own words--take notes on articles and write summary
of notes--hand in notes and summaries

Thursday

- 55 min.--Discussion Groups, Linnet - 307
Myers - Auditorium
- - - - - Foster - 308 - - - - -
- 55 min.--Reports on Aztecs

Friday

- Review of Week's Material and Quiz
- Reports on Aztecs
-
-

Week of May 23-27, 1966

Monday

- Myers -Latin American Colonization and Independence
and -Trace pattern of colonization on outline maps
Foster Areas of Spanish Colonies
Areas of Portuguese Colonies
Non-Hispanic Colonies
-Film, Age of Discovery: Spanish and Portuguese Colonies
-Finish Reports
-

Tuesday

- Linnet -Comparison of informative reports or articles with
short fictional stories
-Setting, characters, theme of story
-20 minutes to write a trial story
-Read stories aloud
-Assign stories with setting in colonial Latin
America with characters from particular class
structure
-

Wednesday

- Myers -Hand out mimeographed outlines with questions cover-
and ing colonization to independence
Foster -Lecture on outlines (1st half), answering questions
20_min. - - - - -
Linnet -Review assignment
-Explain class structure
-

Thursday

- Myers -Cover last half of outlines
and
Foster
20_min. - - - - -
Linnet -Work on stories--give help to those having diffi-
culties--hand in stories at end of period
-

Friday

- Myers -Quiz from outlines--30 minutes
and
Foster - - - - -
Linnet -Read best stories and discuss them--good points--
weaknesses
-

Week of May 30-June 3, 1966

Monday

Foster -Latin America and the United States

and -Monroe Doctrine

Myers -Mexican War

55 min.-United States intervention

- - - -Collect news articles on Latin America_ - - - - -

Linnet -Watching for current events

-Recognition of fact and opinion

Tuesday

Foster -Latin America and the United States Today

and -Aid programs

Myers -Organization of American States (OAS)

55 min. - - - - -

Linnet -Summarizing news articles

-Review of recognition of bias--exercises in class

Wednesday

Foster -Cuba

and -Dominican Republic

Myers

55 min. - - - - -

All -Review of Unit

Thursday

-Discussion Groups--Linnet - 307

Myers - 308

- - - - - Foster - Auditorium_ - - - - -

-Study period--individual help

Friday

Myers -Unit Exam--55 minutes

and

Foster - - - - -

Linnet -Exam on informative articles and short stories

55 minutes

AN ANALYSIS OF A TEAM TEACHING PROJECT
AT CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL,
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

by

VERL DEAN MARTIN
B. A., Phillips University, 1964

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1966

The faculty and staff of Central High School, Kansas City, Missouri, were plagued at the beginning of the 1964-1965 school year with the seemingly overwhelming problems of pupil underachievement and a grossly overcrowded building. In an effort to alleviate both problems, administrators turned to the concept of team teaching. The Spring semester of the aforementioned school session saw the introduction of four team programs involving four hundred students and ten teachers.

The purpose of this study was to describe one of those programs, in particular the project in tenth grade English and World History, which involved some one hundred seventy students and three teachers. In addition to the description, an analysis of the various features of the project was made in relation to its stated objectives, and, finally, an overall evaluation was attempted which would suggest means for improvement.

These purposes were achieved by means of information gained through observations, interviews, and a review of literature on the subject of team teaching. Articles, reports of team projects, and books on team teaching that had been published since 1959 were utilized in that review.

The objectives for the team project were (1) to utilize more effectively existing space and personnel;

(2) to provide a more effective utilization of available materials and resources; and (3) through these first two steps, to provide a more diversified, and therefore more effective, learning process.

The investigation of the World History and English team teaching project revealed that these objectives were being fulfilled only in a very limited sense, so limited in fact that the overall value of the project was questionable. This conclusion was based upon the following facts. The assumption most basic to the objectives, that diversification of approach leads to more effective learning, was lost by the overwhelming dominance of presentation or lecture periods. This dominance was fostered by (1) inadequate planning on the part of administrators and participating faculty, (2) facilities that were not entirely appropriate, (3) the unfortunate development of a crippling disagreement that developed between team members, and (4) the lack of adequate devices for evaluation.

Suggestions for improvement were that (1) more adequate preparation be attained by use of a special consultant and study of pertinent literature by administrators and team members; (2) more attention be paid to educational philosophy and personality in the selection of team teachers; (3) more flexibility and diversity be made possible by installation of moveable partitions in the team classroom and

more effective use of teacher specialization; and (4) that provisions for evaluation of pupil achievement, materials and resources utilized, and personnel be included from the point of initiation of the project.